

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 14, 15 and 17 – 23 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 12 are independent.

In the present response, the claims 1 and 12 are amended. The support for the claim amendment may be found in Applicants' specification, for example, page 12, lines 18 – 21. No new matter is added.

35 U.S.C. §102

Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and (e), the Office rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 14, 15 and 17 – 23 over Nakahara et al. (US 2003/0018491), hereinafter Nakahara.

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 14, 15 and 17 – 23 are patentable over Nakahara.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

*“wherein access to the at least one content item (C1, C2, ..., CN2) is obtained, via an authorization certificate, by verifying that the at least one content item (C1, C2, ..., CN2) and the at least one user (P1, P2, ..., PN1) are linked to the same domain identifier (Domain_ID) or by verifying that the at least one device (D1, D2, ..., DM) and the at least one content item (C1, C2, ..., CN2)) are linked to the same domain identifier (Domain_ID);
wherein the authorization certificate includes the domain identifier (Domain_ID) as a holder of the authorization certificate.”*

Nakahara does not disclose that the certificate identifies the domain identifier (Domain_ID) as a holder of the certificate. Furthermore, in the Office Action, page 10, the Patent Office stated that inclusion of the details regarding identifiers in authorization certificate in the claims would overcome the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections.

In view of at least the foregoing, Nakahara does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, thus Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Nakahara.

Similarly, independent claim 12, in part, requires:

“wherein access to the at least one content item (C1, C2, ..., CN2) is obtained, via an authorization certificate, by verifying that the at least one content item (C1, C2, ..., CN2) and the at least one user (P1, P2, ..., PN1) are linked to the same domain identifier (Domain_ID) or by verifying that the at least one device (D1, D2, ..., DM) and the at least one content item (C1, C2, ..., CN2) are linked to the same domain identifier (Domain_ID);

wherein the authorization certificate includes the domain identifier (Domain_ID) as a holder of the authorization certificate.”

Since claim 12 contains at least the similar distinguishing features as in claim 1, Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments for claim 1 and apply them to claim 12, pointing out why claim 12 is patentable over Nakahara.

Dependent claims 3, 4, 6 – 11, 14, 15 and 17 – 23 respectively depend from and inherit all the respective features of claims 1 and 12. Thus claims 3, 4, 6 – 11, 14, 15 and 17 – 23 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to each independent claim, from which they depend, with each dependent claim containing further distinguishing patentable features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 14, 15 and 17 – 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and (e) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection and rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Brian S. Myers/
Brian S. Myers
Registration No.: 46,947
Myers Wolin, LLC
Phone: (973) 401-7157
For: Kevin C. Ecker
Registration No.: 43,600
Phone: (914) 333-9618

Please direct all correspondence to:
Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 140510-800